



**VASQUEZ BOULEVARD/INTERSTATE 70 SITE  
WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY  
October 7, 1999  
Swansea Recreation Center**

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**Working Group**

Joan Hooker, Clayton Neighborhood  
Anthony Thomas, Clayton Neighborhood  
Michael Maes, Elyria Neighborhood  
Lorraine Granado, Community Coalition  
Chuck Patterson, Globeville Neighborhood  
Sandy Douglas, Cole Neighborhood  
Barbara O'Grady, State of Colorado, Dept. of Public Health and Environment  
Jane Mitchell, State of Colorado, Department of Public Health and Environment  
Frances Hartogh, State of Colorado Attorney General's Office  
Bonnie Lavelle, EPA Region 8  
Chris Weis, EPA Region 8  
Matt Cohn, EPA Region 8  
David Mellard, ATSDR  
Susan Muza, ATSDR  
Bob Little, Asarco  
Linda Larson, Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe (Asarco)  
Celia VanDerLoop, City and County of Denver, Dept. of Environmental Health

**Contact Group**

Joyce Tsuji, Exponent (Asarco)  
Ted Fellman, EPA Region 8  
Pat Courtney, EPA Region 8  
Deldi Reyes, EPA Region 8  
Michael Wenstrom, EPA Region 8  
Nancy Strauss, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment  
Mark Rudolph, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment  
Fonda Apostolopoulos, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment  
Santee Coulberson, ATSDR  
Theresa NeSmith, ATSDR  
David Hewitt, ATSDR

**Facilitators**

Mary Margaret Golten, CDR Associates  
Louise Smart, CDR Associates  
Stuart Binstock, CDR Associates, note taker

## COMMUNITY ISSUES: DISCUSSION OF ATSDR/EPA AND HEALTH ISSUES

Anthony Thomas distributed sections from past Meeting Summaries, to provide insight into the formation of the Health Team. He referred to:

### 1. Meeting Summary, December 8, 1998 –

*“Expectations for the Working Group:*

- To have full involvement of ATSDR in the process and to inform the community about health implications*
- To have the Working Group help ATSDR in ATSDR's four areas of responsibility: health evaluation of data, community involvement, education, and communication of health studies”*

### 2. Meeting Summary, January 28, 1999 –

*“ATSDR looks at the current health effects and actual disease rates associated with a Superfund site. EPA looks at chemicals of concern to predict potential health risk, but does not look at existing health conditions.”*

Anthony said he sees the role of ATSDR as helping the community understand health implications. Matt Cohn explained that ATSDR was created by CERCLA. CERCLA assigned different responsibilities to ATSDR and EPA and envisioned that, as partner agencies, together they would deal with human health. Bonnie Lavelle said EPA's responsibilities on a Superfund site where EPA is the lead agency is to use Superfund money to clean up contamination and to look at human receptors and ecological receptors. EPA's role is to investigate contamination and define its nature, to conduct a risk assessment for human health and an ecological risk assessment as a basis for deciding if cleanup will occur. In addition, if EPA can identify a party who is responsible for the contamination, then EPA has the responsibility to encourage that party to do the cleanup rather than use government money.

Louise Smart observed there seemed to be some continuing confusion about the role of EPA and ATSDR relevant to human health and encouraged Working Group discussion to clarify this.

Lorraine Granado distinguished between EPA's consideration of health risks and ATSDR's consideration of health effects. She said that in the Globe suit, the judge's emphasis was on natural resources, not human health. Frances Hartogh explained that Globe was a different situation from Vasquez. Matt Cohn said one source of the confusion might be that CERCLA provides for natural resources damages, not for damages for human health effects. Bonnie clarified that one reason EPA is not focused on health effects is that EPA is not required to demonstrate that human health effects have occurred in order to determine whether to conduct cleanup.

Regarding the role of the Health Team, Lorraine commented that the community feels they can sit down with ATSDR and talk about their current health problems and

concerns, such as skin problems and asthma. David Mellard said ATSDR will use EPA's environmental and other information to make decisions about what studies or investigations ATSDR should conduct. He distinguished between the risk of health effects (EPA's concern) and the rate of health effects. He noted that although the Health Team is separate from the Working Group, ATSDR and EPA are working on how to improve the communications between the Health Team and the Working Group. Bob Litle offered the assistance of Joyce Tsuji to the community as a resource, since Joyce is an expert on contamination and health issues. He added that he understood ATSDR would not be conducting a quantitative risk assessment.

Lorraine Granado raised the question: What if the EPA and ATSDR come to different conclusions? She said that in this event, the agencies should not seek a compromise position. It was agreed that if EPA and ATSDR do come to different conclusions, each agency will explain the basis for its conclusions. Such a difference may occur since each agency has a different purpose. David Mellard said the purpose of sharing each segment of ATSDR's Public Health Assessment with the Health Team and then with the Working Group, is to allow the Health Team and the Working Group to look at the information together.

Chuck Patterson asked ATSDR whether ATSDR will do diagnosis and treatment or any counseling if people think they are sick because of the contamination. David said ATSDR's Division of Health Education and Promotion will decide whether ATSDR will refer people to the Association of Occupational and Environmental Clinics (AOEC) for a medical evaluation. Susan Muza added that ATSDR will not do treatment. Following an evaluation by AOEC, people could be referred to a local physician.

Sandy Douglas distributed Cole's newsletter.

## **TARGETED ENFORCEMENT INITIATIVE**

Mike Wenstrom reported on the enforcement effort being initiated in north Denver (separate from the Superfund project). His presentation and Working Group discussion included the following points:

- This initiative is a comprehensive response to concerns raised by the Vasquez/I-70 community and will include inspections and compliance actions. The concept is to have coordination of environmental regulation and to take a focused look at a large area. EPA has prepared a map of the proposed area for discussion purposes.
- The initiative involves all of the environmental media programs regulated by EPA Region 8.
- The City and State want to participate in this effort. There is a signed Performance Partnership Agreement (PPA) between the State and EPA that includes this initiative. Under a PPA, federal funds are transferred to the State to carry out

environmental programs. This is a vehicle for mutual commitment between federal, state, and local governments. [A copy of the PPA is available from Ray Mohr at CDPHE, phone 303-692-3110.] Sandy Douglas expressed community appreciation for this coordinated effort.

- The payoff of this effort will be reduced pollution and reduced health effects in the defined area.
- EPA wants to solicit feedback from the community about situations which the community thinks may be an environmental problem. EPA will put together a list of items the community might look for.
- Any action against a business will be made public.

EPA will be contacting stakeholders by telephone to discuss the enforcement initiative. A meeting will be set at a later date to coordinate and communicate among agencies and the community regarding the Targeted Enforcement Initiative.

### **PROGRESS REPORT ON PHASE 3 SAMPLING**

Bonnie Lavelle reported on the Phase 3 sampling program:

- EPA has received 1,362 access agreements, has sampled 1,088 properties, and has sent out a second mailing to obtain additional access consent.
- 2000 samples, from 666 properties, have been analyzed so far.
- The detection limit is 12-16 ppm arsenic. The Working Group agreed this is a good level of detection. EPA has confidence that they can detect arsenic above 12-16 ppm.
- At this point, EPA is considering all the data very preliminary and is conducting quality assurance checks on the data. EPA will complete the quality assurance on the data before the data is released to or used by any party. Once the data has been qualified, it will be released to everyone at once.
- When the data is released to the residents, EPA will send a letter explaining the implications of the data. Bonnie will get input from the Working Group on the language for this letter. In addition, EPA may hold open houses to be available to people who have questions about the data and what it means. The State would like a more active role in consulting with EPA on the methodology for distribution of the data. The community also would like to be involved in this.
- Preliminarily, EPA has found:
  - ♦ 60 to 80 properties with concentrations of arsenic over 100 ppm

- ♦ 150 (the vast majority) properties with concentrations between 10-20 ppm
  - ♦ 10 to 20 properties with concentrations between 30-40 ppm
  - ♦ 10-20 properties with concentrations between 40-50 ppm
- EPA will prepare preliminary summary statistics and provide these to the Working Group, including the number of properties over 450 ppm (the time-critical removal level). The Working Group would like to have the confidence level included in this preliminary data.
  - EPA has seen and expects to see more properties where removal action will be needed (over 450 ppm). EPA does not plan to initiate any removals until the data has been released. In December or January, EPA will decide whether to conduct the removal in the winter or wait until spring. EPA does not feel that waiting for removal will not put anyone at risk. (A clarification was made that such potential removals due to high concentrations of arsenic does not indicate any decision on the "action level", which will be the product of decision making following the risk assessment.) EPA will conduct additional sampling of properties that are over 450 ppm.
  - Because there is a discrepancy in the way sampling was conducted in Phases 1 and 2 as compared with Phase 3, EPA is considering whether or not they need to go back and re-sample property sampled during Phase 1 and 2. EPA will conduct an open discussion on this issue with the Working Group and may schedule a Technical Meeting on this issue.

The Working Group discussed access. Anthony Thomas asked about EPA progress on getting Denver Housing Authority homes tested; Bonnie said she would find out about this. Celia VanDerLoop mentioned the presence of some licensed day care businesses that are not residential; Bonnie said EPA is tracking those now. Celia will check on day care locations for Bonnie. Sandy Douglas asked how the community could help the EPA obtain access agreements. **There will be a neighborhood meeting on Monday, October 18 from 1:30 –2:45 at the Coalition office to advise EPA on access.**

The Working Group discussed the question of liability for owners of properties larger than 4 units. Matt Cohn explained EPA's homeowner liability policy that applies to property owners of up to four units. This policy says homeowners will not be held liable for contamination if their property was residential and if they did nothing to exacerbate the contamination. However, there is no corresponding policy for landlords of properties larger than four units. EPA will deal with these landlords individually. Working Group discussion focused on the dilemma of needing to obtain access from these landlords and their fear that they might have to pay for cleanup, and included the following points:

- EPA does not typically go after landlords; instead EPA goes after the companies who created the contamination or EPA pays for the cleanup itself. EPA is in the process of evaluating liability information through the soil characterization study.

- Cooperation by landlords may lessen the risk EPA might come after them for the cost of cleanup.
- On other sites, when cleanup has begun, landlords have realized they were actually devaluing their property by not finding out about contamination on their property and having it cleaned up if needed. They have then become cooperative.
- The community wants properties cleaned up that should be cleaned up but does not want to force someone out of business or force them to lose their livelihood.
- Where landlords have been exploitative in the community, the community would support EPA's requiring access.
- Fonda Apostolopoulos distributed an example of a "comfort letter" the State has used at the Globe site.
- EPA will seek community input regarding whether or not to force a property owner to allow access for sampling.

## **VEGETABLE SAMPLING PLAN**

EPA has received comments from ATSDR and from Asarco on the vegetable sampling plan and is beginning to obtain access to sample residents' vegetables. EPA hopes to use the same properties for dust sampling. The selection of properties is random.

Joyce Tsuji distributed vegetable study information.

## **EXPOSURE PARAMETERS**

Bonnie Lavelle reviewed the Superfund process and how EPA has progressed through the steps. EPA has been collecting data and will use that data to do an assessment of risk. EPA will then make a decision on whether to clean up any properties at the site and will decide "how clean is clean." EPA will consider the cleanup options, present those options in EPA's Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study report (RI/FS), and put that report out for public comment. EPA will then make a final decision on cleanup, which will be included in EPA's Proposed Plan of Action leading to the Record of Decision (ROD). EPA will then implement any cleanup included in the ROD.

To date, EPA has identified exposed people and developed a set of exposure pathways for people, including:

- Ingestion of garden vegetables
- Ingestion of soil
- Ingestion of indoor dust

- Inhalation of indoor dust
- Inhalation of outdoor dust

These exposure pathways are included in the Conceptual Site Model. David Mellard said these are the same exposure pathways ATSDR will look at. He noted that he will focus more on air, depending on available data, and will make comparisons between indoor air and ambient air.

Bonnie distributed "Exposure Parameters for Evaluation of Exposure to Soil and Dust in the Residential Scenarios" and asked the Working Group whether this format was useful to them and to give her input regarding how well the exposure assumptions fit the people living in this community. For example, for determining frequency of exposure, EPA is assuming people will be spending 350 days/year living in their home and that adults will live in their homes for 24 years. Discussion included the following:

- (Lorraine Granado and Anthony Thomas) This is a very stable neighborhood. There are two populations in this community: (a) historic residents who have lived in the community for a long time (Lorraine and Michael Maes have lived in the community over 40 years) and (b) newer residents with young families, who have lived in the community for less than five years.
- (Lorraine) The community is 70-80% Latino. Latinos tend to be smaller in size than other populations.
- (Lorraine) The 350-days/year-frequency assumption may be correct for older residents; however it is not correct for younger people and families, some of who may spend a large amount of time in Mexico.
- (Jane Mitchell) The State has information from its biomonitoring program at Globe that can help provide input to these assumptions, especially on the length of time spent in the community. She will provide the questionnaire and data to EPA, protecting confidentiality of individuals.
- (Chris Weis) The goal is to develop an action level that is protective, not of the average person, but of those who are most exposed and at the highest risk. EPA wants to protect the most sensitive sub-population; if it does so, then everyone else will be protected.

Bonnie said she would like written comments on these exposure assumptions from the Working Group by the November Working Group meeting. She will prepare a similar chart of assumptions for the other exposure pathways, including vegetable consumption, will distribute this to the Working Group, and would like comments from the Working Group on whether these assumptions are realistic and represent the community.

**There will be a Technical Meeting to discuss exposure assumptions (October 25, 1-4 PM at CDPHE office, 4300 Cherry Creek Drive South).**

## **BIOAVAILABILITY STUDY**

Bonnie Lavelle told the Working Group that another parameter the EPA will use in the risk assessment is the *dose*, which is the focus of the bioavailability study. Chris Weis explained that EPA is in the process of measuring the bioavailability of arsenic. He said EPA had run into a serious scheduling issue at the Missouri veterinary hospital where the work is being done. He was faced with initiating the study on a short turnaround time or delaying the study until January 15. He decided to go forward with the final plan even though EPA had not yet received formal comments, since the Working Group had been briefed twice on the study plan. He has now received comments from Asarco and from the State and has gone through those comments with the design team. None of the comments would have caused him to delay the study. The issues raised in the comments were issues EPA anticipated. Chris will respond in writing to the comments and will distribute the comments and EPA's responses to the Working Group. In response to a comment from Joyce Tsuji, the study is measuring urinary arsenic in all the animals prior to the second phase of dosing.

EPA has completed one two-week dosing phase and is in the second two-week dosing phase. After the dosing phase, EPA will move into data documentation and data interpretation. As soon as the data is quality-assured, EPA will make it available. Chris expects the bioavailability data to be available in mid-November and the report to be ready by mid-December.

## **TOXICITY ASSESSMENT**

Bonnie Lavelle explained that the exposure assessment will predict the dose of arsenic and lead people will be exposed to in this site area. EPA will adjust this, based on the bioavailability study that will help determine what actually gets into the body's system. A toxicity assessment identifies what is a *safe dose*. Bonnie reminded the Working Group that David Mellard had wanted to be sure EPA was correctly looking at the toxicity of arsenic. This is a national issue with implications for the other regions and must be addressed on a national level. ATSDR and the EPA will work together on this. At the higher levels of ATSDR and the EPA, a Toxicity Working Group headed by Dr. Peter Grevatt (who attended the September Working Group meeting) has been formed to consider the toxicity of arsenic. The Toxicity Working Group will look at acute toxicity (less than two weeks of exposure) and sub-chronic toxicity (a month to two years of exposure). The hope is to have this work done on a fast track so its findings will be available for decision making on the Vasquez site; however, it may take longer than the time frame for the risk assessment at Vasquez. Bonnie told the Vasquez Working Group that if the Toxicity Working Group process takes a long time, EPA Region 8 will prepare its risk assessment using the arsenic toxicity level that has been verified and is on the



books at this time. If the national Toxicity Working Group makes a change, the Record of Decision on the Vasquez site can be amended. Any time-critical removals will occur according to current toxicity levels. Bonnie does not want to delay cleanup waiting for the national Working Group to make its decision.

## **COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

Ted Fellman reported that the EPA conducted two open houses, but that there was very little turnout. EPA's strategy will be take information to the community through meetings already occurring in the community. He believes that when the EPA has the sampling results, people will want to know about these results and what they mean and what EPA is going to do with what was learned from the sampling. EPA has produced a number of materials to provide information to the community: a set of posters, fact sheets for different reading levels, and videos on risk assessment (a ten-minute version and a 30-40 minute version). Ted said the EPA will produce a one-page fact sheet every other month. He will distribute the next fact sheet to the Working Group for their comments. This will probably include an outline of EPA's decision-making process and when EPA will be at each stage of the process.

Joan Hooker said she would like to have a hotline for community members to call to get answers to their questions. Ted's phone number is 303-312-6119 and can serve as such a hotline. In addition, Bonnie will check into using contractor support for a hotline.

Sandy Coulberson reported that the majority of ATSDR's community involvement activities are being conducted through the Health Team. She said ATSDR will be working with the EPA to coordinate meetings, so there will not be so many meetings in the community.

## **HEALTH TEAM**

**Membership.** David Mellard reported that the Health Team has welcomed Mike Wenstrom and Ted Fellman as members.

**September 21 meeting.** On September 21, the Health Team talked about how the Health Team should handle the different documents which will be developed by ATSDR. ATSDR will give the documents first to the Health Team for discussion. Typically, the Health Team will meet the day before the Working Group meeting and discuss the document(s). Then the document(s) will be brought to the Working Group the next day. The Working Group will have thirty days to read the document(s) and get comments to David.

David distributed to the Working Group the Table of Contents and the first chapter of the Public Health Assessment and the projected time line for activities.

David will prepare the discussion section of the Public Health Assessment during the next month. Although this may not be completed by the November Working Group meeting, David anticipates the conclusions and recommendations will be available in December.

**September 28 meeting.** On September 28, the Health Team discussed environmental justice issues. There is a Regional Geographic Initiative (RGI) funded by the national office of the EPA. Its purpose is to look at sources of pollution, to share the information with the community, to give the community information about how to talk with doctors and how to protect health, and to get businesses to respond voluntarily to reduce pollution.

**October 6 meeting.** On October 6, the Health Team discussed biomonitoring, the first section of the Public Health Assessment, and the possibility of identifying local physicians and drafting a letter to these physicians.

**Health Education.** The Working Group discussed health education. Nancy Strauss told the Working Group that the State Health Department has a grant from ATSDR to do health education, including physician education. Bonnie Lavelle raised the question of when would be the best timing for health education: does it make sense to do it before EPA has completed its risk assessment or to wait until the data is available. Nancy said the current plan is to make contact with the doctors to let them know this area is a Superfund site, what the metals of concern are, that young children should have blood lead measured, and whom to contact if they have questions. The Working Group agreed that this is an appropriate approach at this time. Nancy will distribute a draft letter from CPDHE and obtain input on this letter from the Working Group at the November Working Group meeting. An agenda item for the November Working Group meeting will be discussion about education for physicians. Anthony Thomas commented that any tools that can be given to the doctors will be a service to the community. Mark Rudolph pointed out that there are fact sheets on the health effects of arsenic and lead.

**Future Health Team meetings.** The Health Team will meet the day before the November and December Working Group meetings, and will hold other meetings or conference calls on an as-needed basis.

Nancy Strauss requested that minutes, however brief, be distributed from the Health Team meetings.

## **BIOMONITORING**

Dave Hewitt, an occupational medicine physician from ATSDR, distributed a fact sheet on exposure investigations. He described the work of ATSDR's Exposure Investigation Group, a small group of physicians, toxicologists, and occupational hygienists. This group:

- Takes environmental samples
- Takes biological samples
- Does modeling/dose reconstruction

The Exposure Investigation Group plans to consider:

- Whether there is a potentially exposed population
- Whether there is a data gap
- Whether it is feasible to do a test or exercise to determine the exposure (such as biological monitoring)
- Whether the information would have an effect on decision making in the future

ATSDR is concerned with inorganic arsenic; organic arsenic is found in fish or seafood, but does not cause health effects, and can be measured in blood or urine. It is possible to test blood, urine, and hair/fingernails for arsenic. Each test has advantages and limitations. Arsenic leaves the blood quickly, and we cannot distinguish between inorganic and organic arsenic in blood. Urine tests are the best ones for measuring arsenic exposure. However, urine tests only measure exposures that occurred within a few days of the test. There are two types of urine tests: (a) total arsenic tests, which measure the total of inorganic and organic arsenic, and (b) total speciated arsenic tests, which identify the inorganic species and are less influenced by diet. Hair tests enable us to measure exposure that occurred throughout the life of a single hair strand. However, arsenic from external sources can also deposit on the hair, and we can't tell what the person has taken into the body. It is not known what dose will go into the hair, and what is normal. ATSDR believes there is limited diagnostic usefulness from hair testing.

ATSDR proposes to collect urinary samples from people with higher exposures to arsenic; this is not a medical monitoring. ATSDR proposes to select people from properties with higher concentrations of arsenic. ATSDR would tell these people not to eat fish for five days before the test. Although an exposure investigation typically is less than 50 people, ATSDR plans to test 100 people at this site. The purpose of this investigation is to see whether there is actual arsenic exposure in this group and the dose of the exposure.

Discussion of ATSDR's proposal for an exposure investigation included:

- Bob Little asked whether ATSDR has an official opinion on hair testing.
- Jane Mitchell disagreed with ATSDR's characterization of hair testing and said the State has been doing medical testing since 1994 and has learned a lot in that time. She suggested ATSDR put together a group to talk about biomonitoring.
- Joyce Tsuji commented that she believes testing hair is a problem because of the compounding effect of external dust that cannot be washed off. She said this is a particular problem where arsenic is present in dust. She would welcome more

discussion about hair testing. She said that unlike lead and cadmium, there are not accurate procedures for testing for longer-term exposure to arsenic.

- Ted Fellman asked whether biomonitoring for lead exposure should be conducted at the same time. Jane Mitchell said the State is tracking lead through its Medicare programs.
- Biomonitoring for arsenic exposure should occur when people are spending time outside (not during the winter months).

The State has been conducting biomonitoring (also referred to as "medical monitoring") at the Globe site to help people know about their own exposure status as individuals. The State did baseline testing before any cleanup was done at the Globe site and then conducted follow-up testing to see if people were more exposed as a result of the dust caused by the cleanup. The State has tested about 2000 people since 1994 and re-tested more than 300 people whose properties were cleaned up. Mark Rudolph is leading the medical monitoring program for the State.

The State has requested funding from EPA to conduct medical monitoring at the Vasquez site. The State has expertise in biomonitoring and would like to apply this expertise at the Vasquez site. Susan Muza commented that both the State's purpose for conducting biomonitoring (individual health assessment) and ATSDR's purpose (community health assessment) are important. Lorraine Granado noted the community's trust in ATSDR and desire to have ATSDR take the lead on biomonitoring at this site. Jane Mitchell stated that the State has learned much since its early days of conducting biomonitoring. There is a need to coordinate biomonitoring among the agencies.

David Mellard said ATSDR would be willing to listen to and consider these concerns. **There will be a Health Team conference call on Wednesday, October 13 at 9:15 MDT to discuss biomonitoring. There will be a Technical Meeting to discuss biomonitoring and exposure assumptions on October 25, from 1PM to 4PM, at CDPHE, 4300 South Cherry Creek Drive South. This meeting will address (a) the objectives and protocol for biomonitoring and (b) who will do what and when?**

## **SOIL CHARACTERIZATION STUDY**

Bonnie Lavelle said she expects results from this study in February, with results from the PAX study before then. Dr. Drexler has been studying the PAX sample and has recommended a change to the Standard Operating Procedure to address difficulties with the electron microprobe because of the saturation of arsenic. Bonnie will distribute the revised Standard Operating Procedure to the Working Group and would like comments from the Working Group.

## **CORRECTIONS TO MEETING SUMMARIES**

The facilitators reminded the Working Group that the draft meeting summaries from the July, August, and September Working Group meetings had been distributed. Any changes received at this meeting will be incorporated and distributed to the Working Group for review. If no other comments are received on these changes within one week after distribution, the meeting summaries will be considered "Final."

## **MEETING EVALUATION**

What worked well:

- We were able to talk, disagree, and work things out
- Everyone was here
- I appreciated information-sharing from the Health Team

What did not work so well:

- The meeting seemed somewhat repetitive.
- The meeting was too long; people lost focus after 1:00 or 1:30.

## **NEXT STEPS**

The Working Group reviewed the Action Items from the September 2 Working Group meeting, checked off those items which have been completed, carried forward those that have not been completed or are ongoing, and added new items identified at this Working Group meeting. Please see attached "Action Items."

### **Upcoming meetings:**

- Monday, October 18 from 1:30 –2:45 - Neighborhood meeting to advise EPA on access - at the Coalition office
- Monday, October 25, from 1:00 – 4:00 Technical Meeting on (a) exposure assumptions and (b) biomonitoring - at CDPHE, 4300 South Cherry Creek Drive South (video-conferencing may be available)
- Unscheduled – Targeted Enforcement Initiative - Coordination and communication among agencies and the community. Deldi Reyes will schedule this meeting with the others.
- Unscheduled – Technical Meeting to discuss how to deal with the difference between Phases I and II and Phase III Sampling study

**Working Group meetings:**

- Thursday, November 4 – 8:30 to 1:00
- Thursday, December 9 – 8:30 to 1:00

**Health Team meetings:**

- Wednesday, October 13 (conference call) 9:15 AM MDT, on biomonitoring
- Tuesday, November 3
- Wednesday, December 8

**HANDOUTS AT THIS WORKING GROUP MEETING**

- Cole newsletter
- Homeowner Liability Policy – for properties with 4 or fewer units
- Exposure Parameters for Evaluation of Exposure to Soil and Dust in the Residential Scenarios
- Example of “comfort letter” used by the State at another site
- Joyce Tsuji’s information related to study of vegetables
- Table of Contents and the first chapter from ATSDR’s Public Health Assessment; time line for ATSDR activities
- Fact sheet on exposure investigations
- ATSDR’s protocol for biomonitoring (for people who did not already have this)
- Schedule of Anticipated Working Group Activities

## ACTION ITEMS (FROM THE OCTOBER 7, 1999 WORKING GROUP MEETING)

Who will do it?	Task or requested action	By when?
Working Group	Give Ted Fellman suggestions on how to get more information out about the site	Ongoing
Working Group	Give EPA feedback on whether the exposure parameters are accurate for this community	By 11/4
Working Group	Give feedback to David Mellard on Table of Contents, first chapter, and time line of activities for Public Health Assessment	By 11/4
David Mellard	Draft Health Assessment report, to be discussed in the Health Team and subsequently in the WG	Ongoing
David Mellard	Set dates and topics for Health Team meetings; coordinate distribution of agenda with facilitators	Ongoing
EPA	Review Tacoma smelter data, with garden study (before sending out exposure parameters)	
Bonnie Lavelle	Provide access agreement information by neighborhood	
Bonnie Lavelle	Provide information to WG on attic dust	
Bonnie Lavelle	Prepare preliminary statistics on Phase 3 sampling and distribute to WG	
Bonnie Lavelle	Talk with subcontractor regarding hotline for information	
Bonnie Lavelle	Draft and distribute a letter to property owners explaining the implications of the sampling data	
Working Group	Provide comments to Bonnie on the draft letter to property owners	
Bonnie Lavelle and Chris Weis	Draft text describing the assumptions in the risk assessment and send to WG for comments	Before Nov WG meeting
Bonnie Lavelle	Distribute the revised Standard Operating Procedures for the PAX sample	
Working Group	Give Bonnie comments on the revised Standard Operating Procedures for the PAX sample	
Chris Weis	Draft skeletal outline of the Risk Assessment and send to WG	By Dec WG meeting
Chris Weis	Distribute to WG comments on the final bioavailability study plan and EPA responses	
Bonnie Lavelle	Distribute final bioavailability study plan to WG	
Celia Vanderloop	Give information to Bonnie on Day Care locations in the site area	
Jane Mitchell	Give to EPA data from the biomonitoring questionnaire at Globe, re: exposure parameters	
Nancy Strauss	Draft a letter to physicians and distribute to WG for comments	